



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

spoken of at length, but no mention is made of the adverse judgment of Libanius (e.g. iii. 436. 18) and others on Constantius.

Barbagallo states (p. 223) that Constantine was the first emperor to extend privileges to members of the family of a teacher. Hadrian, however, is said (Philos. 532) to have extended to Polemo's children the privilege of traveling by land or sea free of charge.

These are comparatively slight matters, however, in part involving but questions of personal judgment, and do not detract from the value of the book as a whole.

J. W. H. WALDEN

The Separation of the Attributive Adjective from Its Substantive in Plautus. By WINTHROP L. KEEP. [*University of California Publications in Classical Philology*, Vol. II, No. 7, pp. 151-64. Berkeley, 1911.]

Such impropriety as may be involved in my reviewing an abstract of a dissertation of which I suggested the subject may be condoned by the fact that the close criticism of the thesis in its later stages was in more competent hands. My interest in the theme prompts some general remarks that may be suggestive to future investigators.

The earliest Latin prose is said to exhibit the close juxtaposition of the attributive adjective and its substantive; rarely a word or two intervenes, in that case of an enclitic nature or constituting a single unit of thought. Contemporary poetry clearly shows greater freedom. Later prose shows greater freedom, though the extent and nature of it remain as yet undefined. Is it possible to trace any historical development in this matter? Is the greater freedom of later prose a reflection of the freedom that grew up naturally under metrical and stylistic conditions peculiar to poetry in the earliest period of Latin? Or did rhythmical conditions and other factors within the prose itself after it became more consciously artistic promote separation? Such are some of the questions I hoped to see partially answered in the present paper. The writer in his abstract has intelligently described some phases of the question in Plautus; such criticism as I should be disposed to make concerns rather omissions than errors of statement. These omissions are perhaps due to the abbreviated form in which the paper appears.

The writer starts with a generalization for which I crave all the evidence. He declares that close juxtaposition is normal in Plautus and all early poetry before 100 B.C. The mere proof of this statement would be of more value than the content of the abstract. The implication is that the examples of various sorts discussed in the abstract are not real, but only apparent, violations of the norm. But, however we may abhor statistics, some figures are necessary to convince us of the norm; a single play of Plautus would

furnish, temporarily, sufficient and suggestive evidence; we cannot easily grant that the examples are merely apparent exceptions until we know the proportion in which they stand to the total. Nor is the writer fortunate in his choice of the inseparability of *res divina*, *Iuppiter supremus*, as evidence to support the generalization; formulas, especially ritualistic formulas, will be the last to yield to separation; one might as well quote *iusiurandum* as *Iuppiter supremus*; yet precisely this type of groups we should be glad to see the writer enlarge from Plautus. Without knowing the extent of inseparable formulaic groups we are in danger of misinterpreting evidence.

In general the rubrics of the descriptive treatment are well chosen, although "art-separations" is singularly infelicitous. The writer is well aware that any rubrics are misleading, that no one feature is easily proved to be dominant exclusive of other features. But some objection may reasonably be made in so far as the author has contented himself with describing features within well-established categories when his material often leads to the determination of new factors; the pitiless pursuit of several lines of thought suggested here and there would be of great assistance to his co-laborers. For example, our attention is rightly called (p. 154) to cases in which adjective and noun appear respectively before the principal caesura or diaeresis, and at the end of the verse; this feature is very general in many varieties of classical verse; now the very fact that the caesura and the end of the verse appear in this description should suggest metrical conditions as dominant factors, and one has only to look up Mr. Keep's examples to find that in the different types of iambic and trochaic verse the adjectives before the caesura or diaeresis fall within a very limited number of metrical types; a study of these metrical types, molossic words, bacchiac words, etc., in a single play might lead to convincing conclusions as to the dominant factor in such separation. In other words, fully as he knows the metrical peculiarities of the end of the verse, the author does not discover for himself the peculiarities that mark the end of the shorter metrical phrase. Again (pp. 160 ff.), the author has material that points to the possibility of an old and well-established triadic grouping of adjective, verb, and noun; here a glance at Homer, or at Lindhamer *Zur Wortstellung im Griechischen*, Münster, 1908, would establish certain presuppositions of value to the student of the phenomenon in Latin.

In details the writer occasionally misses valuable points. The significance of *Bacch.* 926 (p. 160) is certainly not in the metrical convenience of *manu*, but in the sound-effects; otherwise *moenitum divina manu* would serve. The generalization on the top of p. 162 is important and warrants more careful account of the exceptions. On the top of p. 163 the inference with regard to *bonus* is not convincing until we know how often the adjective stands at the beginning of the verse in Plautus, quite apart from the question of emphasis. In the list that follows, the adjectives, except *verus*, seem to belong to special categories (size and quantity) that set them apart;

in this same class would fall the cases of *omnis* on p. 164. In other words, there is no clear evidence of the need of such a loose rubric as "miscellaneous separations."

As a brief abstract the paper is intelligent so far as it goes. But a student who professes to have covered his subject not only for Plautus but for all early poetry prior to 100 B.C. may well have reached more clear-cut and significant conclusions. I hope that "after further study and reflection" the writer will publish a more nearly complete account which will make unnecessary a repetition of his industrious effort by other scholars.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Horace: Odes and Epodes. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by PAUL SHOREY. Revised by PAUL SHOREY and GORDON J. LAING. Boston: Benj. H. Sanborn & Co., 1910. Pp. 514.

This revision of Professor Shorey's well-known edition of Horace's *Odes* has made no change of importance, as the preface informs us, in the general introduction or the introductions to the different odes except for the addition of a few references to recent literature, as, e.g., to Reitzenstein's valuable investigations of the "consolatio" and "recusatio" and other common themes of ancient lyric poetry. The introduction to the *Carmen saeculare*, however, has been considerably expanded by a sketch of the origin and occasion of the *Ludi saeculares* in place of the brief reference to the classical dictionary in the first edition.

The text is practically unchanged except by the substitution of the ending *-is* for *-es* in the accusative plural of *i*-stems. The notes, however, show on almost every page numerous additions, excisions, and alterations, made for the greater part by Professor Laing with a view of assisting more effectively the unlearned student. In this he seems to have succeeded admirably and to have met the only serious criticism of the previous edition. The former frequent references to the lexicon, viz., "Lex. s.v.," for the exact meaning of a word have been replaced by the proper rendering itself, and these English equivalents are both felicitous and numerous. Concise explanations of allusions have also been inserted instead of references to the classical dictionary. Thus, for example, the somewhat baffling remark on *Od.* i. 19, "Horace's wines are all in the lexicon," is replaced by an almost equally brief line sufficiently explaining the allusion. Other notes, indirect or subtle, have been made plainer, and many long, involved phrases of the odes have been elucidated more fully by translation or explanation of the construction.

To find space for these additions without rendering the volume more cumbersome than before, numerous parallel passages, especially in French